

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/628,947	Applicant(s) MAY, GREGORY J.	
	Examiner Rochelle Blackman	Art Unit 2851	

All Participants:

(1) Rochelle Blackman.

(2) Glenn E. Forbis.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 July 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

19 and 36

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's representative requested clarification of the Examiner's reasons for allowing claim 36 in the amendment filed on July 5, 2006. Examiner contacted Applicant's representative to clarify the Examiner's reason for allowing claim 36 as requested in the July 5, 2006 amendment. Examiner informed Applicant's representative dependent claim 36 was inadvertently indicated as allowable along with claim 35 and claim 36 would have been rejected by Toide et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,739,865) along with claim 19, from which it depends upon. Examiner also contacted Applicant's representative to clarify whether or not Applicant's representative intended to amend dependent claim 36 as indicated in the REMARKS of the July 5, 2006 amendment, due to the listing of the claims showing dependent claim 36 as not amended and labeled "previously presented". Applicant's representative informed the Examiner claim 36 will not be amended and will remain as "previously presented" as indicated in the listing of claims of the July 5, 2006 amendment.